|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting:** Literacy Workgroup | | | **Roles:** Note Taker: Rae Lynn McCarthy | | | Timekeeper: Patti Davis |
| **Date: 3/8/2012** | | **Start Time:** 9:00 | **End Time:** 4:00 | | |  |
| **Location;** Albany Library | | | **Participants:** Lorri Gumanow, Candy Baxter, Sue Locke-Scott, Linda Chaffkin, Christina Cloidt, Rae Lynn McCarthy, Patti Davis | | | |
| 9:00 | **Topic: Welcome**   * **Key Points:** * Welcome Back * New member welcome * Inclusion Activity * Review agenda and Norms * **Questions:** * Are there any additional topics that need to be addressed? | | **Process:**  “I’m In”  Dialogue  Discussion | **Outcome:**  Added to the agenda “research based” vs. “evidence based”   * Discussed the levels of research based on AFT article (see attached) * Changed norms to: * Prepare a roadmap for meetings which includes times and expected outcomes * Be a sensitive and responsible adult * Log-in and check wiki for updates * All opinions and philosophies are considered * Base products/dialogue/discussion whenever possible on seminal, level 3 research * All members have a role * Enjoy!   **To Do:**  Add updated norms to Wiki  Send Wiki invitations to new members | | |
| 10:00 | **Topic: Elephant in the Room**   * **Key Points:** * Brief Historical Timeline * Reinventing Ourselves * **Questions:** * How do we see the role of the literacy workgroup? Currently? In the future? * Has/have the current directives been fulfilled? * Looking to the future of the network including the PLC (professional learning center), how does our work evolve, change or diminish? | | **Process:**  Dialogue  Discussion | **Outcome:**  Discussed the history of the work groups. Where have we come from? We moved from Focus to work groups. Work groups did not have role limits, defined expectations, etc. That changed in 2010. There are three-year term limits and there is a coordinator on each workgroup. Our charge was initially to develop the QI guides and then to inform professional development for new SESIS and Statewide meetings. We currently have met the directives as they were given.  The focus on the current QI has much more information on good best practices for all students and SESIS are now asking for more specific strategies around SDI for students with disabilities in each area (vocabulary, assessment, comprehension, use of data, phonics, etc).    **To do:**    Send the common core article for SPED to group-Rae Lynn | | |
| 11:30 | LUNCH | | 11:30 | LUNCH | | |
| 12:30 | **Topic: Now what?**   * **Key Points:** * Develop a structure for the “new” literacy workgroup if decided * **Questions:** * If the literacy workgroup is to continue, what should our work: * Be defined * Look like * Be structured * What would be our vision/mission as we move forward? | | **Process:**  Dialogue  Discussion | **Outcome:**  A new charge would be to focus on SDI in the literacy workgroup.  Focus would be on specially designed instruction in the area of literacy as well as how to use assessment/data to drive not only district level change, but also individual student instruction. How to use data to drive instruction, how to you make connections between grade levels (elementary-middle), how do you choose an appropriate intervention based on student data profiles? When do you decide to assess further? Add writing to the focus of the group  **Statement of Intent:**  To develop guidance in the forms of updates to the LQI and professional development in the area of literacy assessment and data use to guide explicit literacy instruction. This will assist SESIS in coaching both district level change and individual teaching to improve outcomes for students with disability.  **Goals:**   * Expand the amount of information in the LQI on explicit literacy instruction around the five pillars of reading and writing * Develop guidelines for choosing effective assessments and research-based literacy interventions * Develop protocols to guide data discussions and determine appropriate instructional interventions * Create professional development modules to increase SESIS knowledge in the area of explicit literacy instruction and assessment   **To Do:**   * All current members should continue if desired * Need to add both a non-district and Regional Trainer * May want to ask for an expert from higher education * How will ESEA waiver affect the work of this group? * Write a plan to send to the coordinators and SED-Rae Lynn and Christina | | |
| 2:00 | **Topic: Logistical Components**   * **Key Points:** * Membership * Meeting Frequency   **Questions**   * What recommendations can we make for requirements of membership? * What frequency of meeting do we believe we need in order to accomplish our goals? Is it variable? | | **Process:**  Dialogue | **Outcome:**   * Since we are a new group, all members have the choice to remain. We need to add new membership from non-district and RSET. * Meetings would be held quarterly with work being completed in between meetings via phone conference, webinar or video chat.   2011-12  May 31-June 1 Meeting in Albany  2012-13  July 26-27 Meeting in Albany  December TBD  March TBD  June TBD  **To Do:** | | |
| 3:45 | **Topic: Wrap Up**   * **Key Points:** * Debrief and recap | | **Process:**  Dialogue | **Outcome:**  Discussion around quotes that were shared  Reviewed and updated the agenda for Friday  **To Do:** | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |
| **Date: 3/9/2012** | | **Start Time:** 9:00 | **End Time:** | 12:00 | | |
| **Location:** Holiday Inn Express | | | **Participants:** Lori Gumanow, Sue Locke-Scott, Christina Cloidt, Rae Lynn McCarthy, Candy Baxter, Patti Davis, Linda Chaffkin | | | |
| 9:00 | **Topic: Welcome**   * **Key Points:** * Inclusion Activity * Review Agenda * Pluses and Wishes from previous day * **Questions:** * Do we need to make modification in today’s group process? | | **Process:**  Dialogue | | **Outcome:**   * Good day. Enjoyed our new group. * More time to read all of the things that I need to read. * Every one participated and voiced opinions and everyone was respectful and we accomplished everything on our agenda. * It was nice to be with others from around the state to hear how things are being done. It give a broader perspective. * I appreciated the fact that we got to know each other both personally and professionally throughout the day and the dynamics that developed. Everyone had an open mind. * We decided on a common mission and goals and we all agreed and it makes sense. It doesn’t duplicate the previous workgroup, the PLC or the SDI work group | |
| 10:00 | **Topic:**   * **Key Points:** * Wiki * Assessment Text * Evidence based vs. research based * **Questions:** | | **Process:**  Activity  Dialogue  Discussion | | Completed Wiki discussion on Thursday. Modeled the use of the Wiki.  Read *Scientifically Based Research vs. Evidence Based Practices and Instruction*   * Discussion around us making recommendations to the network of programs and practices. A lot of new people do not have the knowledge base in the network and need to have more information. * We can talk about efficacy of practices and programs and supply that to the network. * Improving instruction as opposed to recommending programs * Discussion around computer based programs and the need to integrate strategies from these programs into classroom instruction. * Encourage the use of interventions with fidelity * Need to look at the entire structure of lessons * Accessible Instructional Materials * Need to define skill vs. strategy   Some discussion as to whether or not the Assessment book is appropriate for us to read. Is it specific enough for students with disabilities? We agreed that it would serve as a foundation and other books will be researched to add to our library.  We will be reading *Understanding and Using Reading Assessment K-12* by Peter Afflerbach and commenting on three chapters at a time on the Wiki. Chapters 1-3 by March 30, Chapters 4-6 April 30 and Chapters 7-9 by May 30. | |
| 11:00 | **Topic:** New Text Research   * **Key Points:** * Research based literacy text for us: * Requirements * explicit/direct reading instruction for students with disabilities * Other | | **Process:**  Dialogue  Discussion  Internet research | | **Outcome:**  Sue will provide materials to read and discuss regarding developing protocol for determining effectiveness of programs and practices.  Lorrie will send a recommended book list to the group  The group looked at resources brought by Christina | |
| 12:00 | Meeting Ending  Great participation open and honest  Thank you for your patience as we reinvent ourselves | | | | | |
|  | Resources  <http://northfieldtownshipschools.pbworks.com/f/Difference+between+reading+skills+and+strategies.pdf> Skills vs. Strategies  <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/methods/whatworks/eb/evidencebased.pdf> PPT Evidence based vs. scientifically based ppt  <http://dese.mo.gov/se/seap/documents/ScienbasedresearchvsEvidencebasedpracticeandinstruct.pdf> Evidence based vs. scientifically based chart  Torgesen, J.K. (in press). Recent discoveries from research on remedial interventions for children with dyslexia. In M. Snowling and C. Hulme (Eds.). Advances from Research on Dyslexia. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers  <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/topic.cfm?k=L> Center on Instruction  cehs.unl.edu/csi/index.shtml Many reading and cognitive strategies  Email List:  Rae Lynn McCarthy [rmccarthy@gvboces.org](mailto:rmccarthy@gvboces.org)  Christina Cloidt [cloidt@ulsterboces.org](mailto:ccloidt@ulsterboces.org)  Sue Locke-Scott [slockescott@e1b.org](mailto:slockescott@e1b.org)  Lorrie Gumanow [lgumano@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:lgumano@schools.nyc.gov)  Patti Davis [patti.davis@dcboces.org](mailto:patti.davis@dcboces.org)  Candy Baxter [cbaxter@gstboces.org](mailto:cbaxter@gstboces.org)  Kathy Lind [klind@boces.com](mailto:klind@boces.com)  Linda Chaffkin [lchaffki@esboces.org](mailto:lchaffki@esboces.org) | | | | | |